



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/492,265	01/27/2000	Yi-Hsien Hao	34556/JFO/B600	9668
32294	7590	10/29/2003	EXAMINER	
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			PHILPOTT, JUSTIN M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		2665

DATE MAILED: 10/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/492,265	HAO ET AL.
	Examiner Justin M Philpott	Art Unit 2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . 6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In the Amendment filed August 21, 2003, Applicant has amended the title to more particularly describe the invention, amended claims 6, 24, 51, 56 and 58 to correct minor informalities, amended claims 13 and 32 to include the additional term "portion" in the elements "Packet Data Address portion" and "Packet Data Value portion" in an attempt to overcome the present rejection, and has argued that pending claims 1-60 as amended should be allowed. In view of the Amendment, the specification is no longer objected to and the rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 have been overcome. Also, claim 58 is no longer objected to, however, claim 24 remains objected to for reasons discussed in the following office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed August 21, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, Applicant discloses (page 20, paragraph 3) particular advantages of the claimed invention. However, in response to Applicant's argument (page 21, first paragraph) that Muller fails to show certain features of Applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., those disclosed in page 20, paragraph 3) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Second, Applicant argues with respect to claims 1 and 52 (page 21, paragraph 3, continued on page 22) that Muller does not disclose or suggest an arrangement where the forwarding memory 113 and the shared memory manager 220 share a memory block. However, Muller teaches the forwarding memory 113 “stores an address table for matching with the headers of received packets” (col. 4, lines 32-34), the shared memory manager 220 stores incoming packets in the external shared memory 230 (col. 6, lines 28-32), and “the memory for buffering incoming packets is allocated from a common pool of memory (e.g., the shared memory 230) that is shared by all the input ports and output ports” (col. 6, lines 60-63). Thus, Muller anticipates that “shared memory 230” is shared by the forwarding memory 113 and memory manager 220 since both forwarding memory 113 and memory manager 220 receive incoming packets and incoming packets are buffered via shared memory 230.

Third, Applicant argues with respect to claims 1 and 52 (continued paragraph on page 22, last sentence) that the forwarding memory 112 does not correspond to or suggest the ARL of the claimed invention and that the shared memory manager 220 does not correspond to or suggest the Packet Data Storage Table of the claimed invention. However, the present claim language does not provide any distinction between Applicant’s claimed elements and the above-mentioned elements of Muller. That is, while Applicant may believe that the description of the Address Resolution Table and the Packet Data Storage Table in the specification of the instant application introduces elements which are different from the above-mentioned elements of Muller, one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret elements identified as “Address Resolution Table” and “Packet Data Storage Table” to correspond to the above-mentioned elements described by Muller. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Fourth, Applicant argues with respect to claims 13 and 32 (page 22, first paragraph, continued on page 23) that the shared memory manager 220 of Muller stores pointers but does not store a portion of the *[received] packet* (emphasis added). While claims 13 and 32 have presently been amended to include the additional term “portion” in the elements “Packet Data Address portion” and “Packet Data Value portion” in an attempt to overcome the present rejection, the amended claims do not clearly distinguish Applicant’s above-mentioned claimed elements as comprising portions of the received packet. Likewise, the amended claims do not clearly distinguish Applicant’s above-mentioned claimed elements from the alleged stored pointers of Muller. Thus, Applicant’s argument that Muller stores pointers but does not store a portion of the received packet is moot.

Fifth, Applicant argues with respect to all other pending claims (page 23, paragraph 2 to page 25, continued paragraph) that since Muller suffers from deficiencies discussed above with respect to claims 1, 13, 32 and 52, the remaining claims having common elements should also be allowed. However, as discussed above, Muller teaches all of the elements of claims 1, 13, 32 and 52. Thus, all of claims 1-60 remain rejected in the following office action.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: “24. (Previously Presented)” should be changed to “24. (Currently Amended)” since it appears Applicant chooses to amend claim 24 by changing “present” to “presenting”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-15, 18-21, 23-25, 28-30, 32-34, 37-40, 42-44, 47, 48, 52, 53 and 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,021,132 to Muller et al.

Regarding claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 21, 28, 32-34, 40, 52 and 57, Muller teaches a memory structure (e.g. see FIG. 1 and col. 3, line 52 – col. 7, line 40) comprising an Address Resolution Table (e.g., address table stored in forwarding memory 113, see col. 4, lines 32-34) for resolving addresses in a packet-based network switch (101); and a Packet Storage Table (e.g., shared memory manager 220 locally storing pointers which point to buffers that contain packet data, see col. 6, lines 43-63) adapted to receive a packet for storage in the packet-based network switch and sharing a preselected portion of memory with the Address Resolution Table, wherein Address Resolution Table utilizes a preselected portion of memory comprising the forwarding and filtering database 140 (FIGS. 1 and 2). Furthermore, regarding claims 8, 13, 32, 52 and 57, Muller teaches the Address Resolution Table (113) has an associative memory structure (e.g., associative memory 114 within database 140 and further coupled to switch fabric 210). Still further, regarding claims 8, 9, 13 and 32, Muller teaches the Packet Storage Table is adapted to receive at least one of each of a Packet Data Address (e.g., within the header received from forwarding decision, see col. 5, line 46 – col. 6, line 40) and a Packet Data Value (e.g., a priority indication, see col. 6, line 21). Additionally, regarding claims 11, 33, 52 and 57, Muller teaches

the associative memory structure (114) is a direct-mapped/one-way associative memory structure, such that the associative memory structure (114) stores data associated with each entry in the Address Resolution Table (113) (e.g., see col. 4, lines 30-37).

Regarding claims 2, 18 and 37, Muller further teaches the structure comprises a Transmit Descriptor Table (e.g., output queue, see col. 7, lines 20-25) being associated with a corresponding packet-based network transmit port (output port 206); and a Free Buffer Pool (e.g., shared memory 230 comprising free pool of buffers, see col. 7, lines 25-67) having plural memory buffers each having a pre-determined number of memory locations (e.g., memory lines) associated therewith (e.g., see col. 8, lines 37-51).

Regarding claims 3, 29, 47 and 59, Muller teaches the structure implements an IEEE Standard 802.3 communication protocol (e.g., see col. 3, lines 57-62).

Regarding claims 4, 30, 48, 53 and 60, Muller teaches the switch comprises plural ports (e.g., see FIG. 2 input and output ports 206).

Regarding claims 6, 14 and 58, Muller teaches the associative memory comprises a search structure (e.g., search engine within coupled switch fabric block 210, see col. 6, lines 4-7).

Regarding claims 19, 20, 38 and 39, Muller teaches the Free Buffer Pool further comprises a buffer control memory (e.g., tag array, see col. 9, line 57 – col. 10, line 45) comprising plural memory bits (e.g., represented by rows and columns) uniquely corresponding to ones of the pre-determined number of buffer pool memory locations.

Regarding claims 23 and 42, Muller teaches the structure further comprises a free buffer manager (e.g., shared memory manager comprising buffer tracking unit 329 and coupled with switch fabric 210, see FIGS. 2, 3B and 4) including: a buffer bus controller (e.g., buffer manager

325, see col. 9, line 5 – col. 14, line 37), a buffer bus register (e.g., arbitor 470), a buffer control finite state machine (e.g., array controller 450) operably coupled with the bus controller and the bus register, and a buffer search engine (e.g., search engine within block 210, see col. 6, lines 1-23) operably coupled with the bus controller, bus register, and finite state machine.

Regarding claims 24 and 43, Muller teaches the buffer bus controller comprises a buffer free bus controller (performed by buffer manager 325) for detecting a buffer request (Br_Ptr_IP-Bus Request) and presenting the request to at least one of the finite state machine and the buffer search engine (e.g., see col. 13, lines 5-14), and a buffer grant bus controller (performed by buffer manager 325) for granting an available free buffer (Br_Ptr_Data_BM_to_IP[X:0]) as indicated by the buffer bus register (e.g., see col. 13, lines 15-23).

Regarding claims 25 and 44, Muller teaches the buffer search engine comprises a pipelined buffer search engine by coupling learning logic (e.g., see col. 6, line 5) to the search engine for searching and maintaining the database 140.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
7. Claims 5, 7, 10, 12, 16, 17, 22, 26, 27, 31, 35, 36, 41, 45, 46, 49-51 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller.

Regarding claims 5, 49, 50, 54 and 55, Muller teaches the structure discussed above regarding claims 4, 47 and 52, however, may not specifically require that the switch comprise at least 4 ports or at least 8 ports. However, Muller further teaches a plurality of ports are included

(e.g., see FIG. 2), and Muller does not limit the scope of the invention to a specific number of ports. Thus, the teachings of Muller clearly encompass the limitations of providing at least 4 ports or at least 8 ports. Moreover, it is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on Appellant. In re Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937); Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v. U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 471 (1943); In re Schneider, 148 F.2d 108, 65 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1945); In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955); In re Saether, 492 F.2d 849, 181 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1974); In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 7, 12, 22, 31, 41, 51 and 56, Muller teaches the structure discussed above regarding claims 3, 11, 21, 28, 34, 45 and 52, however, may not specifically disclose a specific number of memory accesses required per Ethernet frame. However, Examiner takes official notice that it is commonly known in the art to perform, e.g., one cycle per Ethernet frame for operations such as address resolution/learning and transmission read/write.

Regarding claim 10, as discussed above regarding claims 2, 18 and 37, Muller teaches the structure comprises a Transmit Descriptor Table (e.g., output queue, see col. 7, lines 20-25) being associated with a corresponding packet-based network transmit port (output port 206); and a Free Buffer Pool (e.g., shared memory 230 comprising free pool of buffers, see col. 7, lines 25-67) having plural memory buffers each having a pre-determined number of memory locations (e.g., memory lines) associated therewith (e.g., see col. 8, lines 37-51). However, Muller may not specifically disclose receiving a Table Descriptor Address and a Table Descriptor Value at

the Transmit Descriptor Table. Nevertheless, Muller clearly suggests that the Transmit Descriptor Table is adapted to receive a Table Descriptor Address and a Table Descriptor Value by way of previous example, wherein Muller teaches Address and Value are received by the Packet Storage Table as discussed above regarding claims 8, 9, 13 and 32, and wherein Muller further teaches in steps (1) – (5) (see col. 5, lines 46-65) processing packets from Address Resolution Table (113) to Packet Storage Table (220) to Free Buffer Pool (230) and finally to Transmit Descriptor Table (at output queue 206), thus, clearly suggesting that Address and Value are also received by the Transmit Descriptor Table. Thus, at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt the Transmit Descriptor Table of Muller to receive a Table Descriptor Address and a Table Descriptor Value as suggested by Muller by teaching adapting the Packet Storage Table to receive an Address and Value and further teaching steps (1) – (5) wherein packets are processed from Packet Storage Table to Free Buffer Pool and finally to Transmit Descriptor Table.

Regarding claims 16, 17, 35 and 36, Muller teaches the structure discussed above regarding claims 13 and 32, however, may not specifically require that the Transmit Descriptor Table (output queue) comprise a circular FIFO memory structure with head and tail pointers. However, Muller clearly teaches performing output queuing (output queues at output ports 206) and Examiner takes official notice that a circular FIFO memory structure with head and tail pointers is well known in the art for implementing suitable output queuing.

Regarding claims 26, 27, 45 and 46, Muller teaches the structure discussed above regarding claims 23 and 42, however, may not specifically require that the buffer bus register comprise an eight-location LIFO. However, Muller clearly teaches performing queuing (output

queues at output ports 206), and Examiner takes official notice that LIFO is a queuing technique well known in the art.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin M Philpott whose telephone number is 703.305.7357. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D Vu can be reached on 703.308.6602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.4750.

jmp
Justin M Philpott

Huy D. Vu
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600